



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,792	01/15/2004	Brian J. Cragun	ROC920030266US1	5430
7590 06/22/2006			EXAMINER	
William J. McGinnis, Jr. IBM Corporation, Dept. 917 3605 Highway 52 North Rochester, MN 55901-7829			DEBROW, JAMES J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/757,792	Applicant(s) CRAGUN ET AL.	
	Examiner James J. Debrow	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 22 May 2006.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 17 are independent claim.

Applicant's Response

3. In Applicant's Response dated 22 May 2006, Applicant amended claims 1, 8, 10, 13 and 17. Applicant argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 31 Mar. 2006

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 4, 7-13, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairchild et al. (Patent No.: 6,728,760 B1; Filing Date: May. 5, 1999) in view of Gupta et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0196164 A1; Filed Sep. 15, 1999) (hereinafter 'Gupta').**

In regard to independent claim 1, Fairchild et al. discloses a *method for managing annotations comprising:*

detecting one or more changes to a document having at least one annotation corresponding to at least one portion of the document prior to occurrence of the one or more changes (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

if so, updating an annotation record based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly, *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document as changed, based on whether one of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected.*

However, Gupta teaches *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected* (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. with Gupta for the benefit of providing

Art Unit: 2176

an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprises:*

copying an existing annotation record referring to the document prior to the one or more changes (column 7, lines 33-35; Fairchild teaches annotations can be copied from one media base to another. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching transferring the annotations of one document to an updated version of that document); *and*

updating the annotation record copied to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 5, lines 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 7, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 1, further comprising, prior to updating the annotation record:*

notifying a user the document has changed (column 1, lines 41-43; column 2, lines 47-52); *and*

receiving validation from the user that the annotation should be applied to the document as changed (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild et al. discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.).

In regard to independent claim 8, Fairchild et al. discloses a *method comprising:*

receiving a document to be checked into a content management system, the document having at least one annotation corresponding to an annotated portion thereof, wherein one or more changes to the document have been made subsequent to creation of the annotation (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to one or more changes in documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly, *determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed, by determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document.*

However, Gupta teaches *determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed, by determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document (0082-0086; Fig.*

Art Unit: 2176

8; Gupta teaches an interface in which the user can select annotations and various UI preferences for the annotations. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that at least one of the UI preference could be an option for the *creator of the annotation to specify whether the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document.*

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *subsequent versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 9, Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 8, wherein determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed comprises determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document by selecting a policy from a set of policies that determine how annotations should be applied to subsequent versions of the document.*

However, Gupta teaches *the method of claim 8, wherein determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed comprises determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document by selecting a policy from a set of policies that*

Art Unit: 2176

determine how annotations should be applied to subsequent versions of the document (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*. 0082-0086; Fig. 8; Gupta further teaches an interface in which the user can select annotations and various UI preferences for the annotations. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that at least one of the UI preferences could be an option for the *creator of the annotation to specify whether the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document*.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 10, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 9, further comprising:*

determining if the user selected a policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild et al. discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.);

prompting a user for such validation (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild et al. discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button, validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.); *and*
updating the annotation record only after receiving such validation (column 5, line 1-5).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *determining if the user selected a policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document.*

However, Gupta teaches *determining if the user selected a policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document* (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular

Art Unit: 2176

version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of a *policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document*. 0090; Gupta further teaches a dialog box that consist of a drop down-menu, which allow the user to select a name set to which the annotation belong. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that this drop down-menu could allow the user to select a policy or an option which selects a policy that specifies validation of the annotation record).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010):

In regard to dependent claim 11, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 8, wherein updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprises:*
running an algorithm to identify the annotated portion of the document

Art Unit: 2176

corresponding to the at least one annotation in the document as changed (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an algorithm is no more than computer software to perform the task as claimed.); and

if the annotated portion is identified by the algorithm, updating the annotation record based on results of running the algorithm (column 5, line 1-5; At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an algorithm is no more than computer software to perform the task as claimed.).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 11, further comprising, if the annotated portion is not identified by the algorithm:*

prompting a user to identify the annotation portion in the document, as changed (column 9, line 25-28); and

updating the annotation record based on input received from the user (column 9, line 28-31).

In regard to independent claim 13, Fairchild et al. discloses *detecting one or more changes to a document having at least one annotation corresponding to at least one portion of the document prior to the one or more change (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);*

updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising::

determining if an annotation corresponding to at least one annotated portion of the document prior to the change should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected.

However, Gupta teaches a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising (0036):

determining if an annotation corresponding to at least one annotated portion of the document prior to the change should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server

Art Unit: 2176

determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 16, Fairchild et al. discloses *updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprising:*

copying an existing annotation record referring to the document prior to the one or more changes (column 7, lines 33-35; Fairchild teaches annotations can be copied from one media base to another. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching transferring the annotations of one document to an updated version of that document); *and*

updating the annotation record copied to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 5, lines 1-5).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13.*

However, Gupta discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13 (0036).*

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gupta with Fairchild et al. for the benefit a computer-readable medium embodied with instructions, when executed by a computer system would enable to computer system to update an annotation record associated with a document.

In regard to independent claim 17, Fairchild et al. *discloses a system comprising:*

at least one application (column 2, lines 15-20);

an annotation maintenance component configured to detect changes to a document managed by the content management system, the document having at least one annotation corresponding to an annotated portion thereof, wherein one or more changes to the document have been made subsequent to creation of the annotation (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.).

update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses

Art Unit: 2176

updating annotation records according to changes in media items (documents). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *a content management system for managing a plurality of documents manipulated by the at least one application; an annotation database for holding annotation records, each containing annotation data related to one or more of the plurality of documents; and determine if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected.*

However, Gupta teaches *a content management system for managing a plurality of documents manipulated by the at least one application* (0045-0051).

an annotation database for holding annotation records, each containing annotation data related to one or more of the plurality of documents (0011; Gupta teaches an annotation server for holding annotations that corresponds to the multimedia content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply Gupta's teaching to documents.).

determine if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected (0095-

Art Unit: 2176

0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Fairchild et al. discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is configured to update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document by updating an annotation index stored in the annotation record* (column 5, lines 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Fairchild et al. discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is configured to update an*

Art Unit: 2176

annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document by updating a change detection value stored in the annotation record (column 5, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 35-40).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Fairchild et al. discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is integrated with the content management system* (column 5, lines 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating and deleting media/document items (*content management*), and updating annotation records (*annotation maintenance*)).

6. **Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairchild et al. (Patent No.: 6,728,760 B1; Filing Date: May. 5, 1999) in view of Gupta et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0196164 A1; Filed Sep. 15, 1999) (hereinafter 'Gupta'), further in view of Sidana (Patent No.: 6,571,295 B1; Filing Date: Jul. 19, 1999).**

In regard to dependent claim 2, Fairchild et al. in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document* (column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other information associated with the document" to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. in view Gupta for the benefit of updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Fairchild et al. in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating one or more indexes to refer to multiple versions of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating one or more indexes to refer to multiple versions of the document* (column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation “other information associated with the document” to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the indexing to refer to multiple versions of a document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. in view Gupta for the benefit of updating to multiple versions of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Fairchild et al. in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein detecting one or more changes to the document comprises comparing change detection values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein detecting one or more changes to the document comprises comparing change detection values generated for*

Art Unit: 2176

the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes (column 10, lines 36-45; Sidana discloses a expired flag (detection value), which indicated a change has occurred in the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. in view Gupta with Sidana for the benefit of detecting one or more changes to the document.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 5, wherein the change detection values are hash values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes.* (column 8, lines 35-40; Fairchild et al. discloses original media item (document) maintains as part of its annotation record, a list of locations (*hash values*) of copies of the media item (*document*). Using this list (hash table), it is possible to find that a cached copy of the media item (*document*) resides in a receiving cache on a server. As with the current invention, Fairchild et al. teaches the concept of a hash table. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that hash tables would contain hash values.).

In regard to dependent claim 14, Fairchild et al. in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13 (column 14, lines 1-2), wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

(column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other information associated with the document" to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. in view Gupta for the benefit of updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Fairchild et al. in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating generating a change detection value for the document, or a portion of the document, to reflect the one or more changes.*

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13 (column 14, lines 1-2), wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating generating a change detection value for the document, or a portion of the document, to reflect the*

Art Unit: 2176

one or more changes (column 10, lines 36-45; Sidana discloses a expired flag (*detection value*), which indicated a change has occurred in the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild et al. in view Gupta with Sidana for the benefit of detecting one or more changes to the document.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 07 Apr. 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 8,13 and 17, along with their respective dependent claims, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New ground(s) of rejection are based on newly found prior art reference of Gupta. An explanation of the rejection is given.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Doug Hutton', with a stylized, cursive script.

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100